



## **Design Review Board**

---

### *Minutes*

**City Council Chambers, Lower Level  
December 4<sup>th</sup>, 2013**

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Lower Level of the Council Chambers  
57 East First Street, at 4:56 p.m.

**Board Members Present:**

Eric Paul – Vice Chair  
Danny Ray  
Taylor Candland  
Brian Sandstrom

**Board Members Absent:**

Ralph Smith – Chair  
Tracy Roedel

**Staff Present:**

John Wesley  
Wahid Alam  
Kim Steadman  
Tom Ellsworth  
Julia Kerran  
Angelica Guevara

**Others Present:**

- A. Discuss and Provide Direction Regarding Design Review cases:

**Design Review Board  
December 4<sup>th</sup>, 2013**

**CASE:** DR13-038: Escobedo- Phase II  
435 North Hibbert

**REQUEST:** Exception to the height limitation

**DISCUSSION:**

Staff member Wahid Alam presented the case to the board. Mr. Alam stated that staff is currently working on the west side with Phase II.

Vice Chair Paul:

- Verified that the materials in Phase II relate to and are carried over from Phase I.
- Thought the elevation on the one-story building looks commercial.
- Asked about the equipment on the roof.
- Stated that the roof may be both pitched roofs and parapets to make it not look so high and still keep an urban look.
- Questioned if the architect had given any thought to the entry ways with four doors on top of each other.
- With thirty to forty feet from the building you may be creating an overkill with the number of trees.

Boardmember Sandstrom:

- Use gables.
- Questioned where the entry ways, in question, were situated on the site plans.
- Asked if there was a chance to pull the entry ways out a foot or two, protrude others or stagger the wall plane to give identity.
- Stated he was looking for more variety.
- Stated that if we are concerned about safety, it may better to have one row of trees and green screen.
- Would prefer to take landscaping from the building side and leave the street scape for shade

Boardmember Candland:

- Agreed with the pitched roofs.
- Asked what the width of the sitting walls were.
- Stated that if you pull the one door out then there will be only two doors in profile at the sidewalk.

Planning Director John Wesley stated that the staff concern with safety and pedestrian access.

## **Design Review Board December 4<sup>th</sup>, 2013**

**CASE:** DR13-041: 3Four5 Villas  
345 South Shouse

**REQUEST:** Review an infill project of 15 2 & 3 bedroom villas.

### **DISCUSSION:**

Staff member Kim Steadman and the architect, James Babos, presented the case to the board. Mr. Steadman stated that this is an infill project of 15 two and three bedroom two-story townhouses.

Vice Chair Paul:

- Asked if the building to the north was two-story.
- Concerned the second floor of the south facing villas look to back of the commercial property.
- Questioned if there was a dual easement.
- Stated that there was too much pavement.
- Suggested that pavement be incorporated to break up the asphalt, create a more personable approach.
- Concerned that with the length and elevation, you loss of the human context.
- Suggested that the elevations and plans are revised to include the ins and outs of the building.
- Stated that the current plans are not realistic.
- Thought it looked Scandinavian and urban.
- Stated that he does not mind it.
- Inquired if the development is compliant zoning, planning, parking and open space.
- Questioned if there is a wall between the project and the multi-family development to the north.
- Expressed that there is a lot of pavement.
- Asked about water retention.
- Verified landscaping and trees to break up the view of the dumpsters in the commercial area.

Boardmember Sandstrom:

- Stated that for some reason the project did not sit well with him.
- Thought it could be the color, the lack of a true defining variety or that it looks like a converted warehouse.
- Not concerned with the use of concrete, as many things can be done with concrete.
- Concerned that there was no back and forth, very plain.
- Stated that with the artificial grass it appears that the project does not want to use water.
- Verified that with the concrete and foam installation that it was reverse ICF.
- Suggested that adding a lighting element to the front may make the project more interesting.
- Stated that piping the retained water out may be more costly.

Boardmember Candland

**Design Review Board  
December 4<sup>th</sup>, 2013**

- Verified that the mechanical equipment was going to be in the backyard.
- Stated that the project is better than what is there

Boardmember Ray

- Stated that there was plenty back of back and forth, since all front entries were back 5'.
- Thought the project was better and interesting.

Staff member Steadman

- Pointed out that going down the street you will notice the in and out of the building.
- Stated that with the construction type they end up with a 14" thick wall.
- Showed that the windows are set back 14" which is a greater reveal than with stucco or wood construction.
- Concerned with the garage scape at first, which is mitigated.
- Concerned that the community experience will be asphalt paved street and not much opportunity to landscape.

## **Design Review Board December 4<sup>th</sup>, 2013**

**B. Call to Order:**

Vice Chair Eric Paul called the meeting to order at 5:38 p.m.

**C. Approval of the Minutes of the November 6<sup>th</sup>, 2013 Meeting:**

On a motion by Boardmember Ray seconded by Boardmember Candland the Board unanimously approved the minutes. Vote 4-0, absent Boardmember Roedel and Chair Smith.

**D. Consent Agenda:**

None.

**E. Action Items:**

**CASE:** DR13-036 Metso Copperstate  
8100-8300 blocks of East Pecos Road (south side) (District 6)

**REQUEST:** Review a 43,425 new square foot industrial facility with a height exception.

**DISCUSSION:**

Staff member Wahid Alam presented the case to the board. Mr. Alam stated that the case has returned to the board as an action item for an exception to the height limitation.

Vice Chair Paul:

- Reviewed the height and the possibility of visual mitigation.
- Suggested a horizontal band or shadow line across the top to cap-off the building.
- Proposed a shadow line, an architectural relief or reveal line to break up the vertical paneling.

Boardmember Sandstrom:

- Agreed with Vice Chair Paul in regards to the banding, shadow line or reveal line.
- Stated that the additional condition was very minor.

On a motion by Boardmember Sandstrom seconded by Boardmember Ray the Board unanimously approved case DR13-035 with the following conditions (absent Chair Smith and Boardmember Roedel):

1. Compliance with all requirements of the Development and Sustainability, Engineering, Transportation, and Solid Waste Departments.
2. Concurrence with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations submitted, except as noted below.
3. Roof and ground mounted mechanical equipment shall be fully screened per Section 11-30-9 of current Mesa Zoning Code.
4. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.

**Design Review Board  
December 4<sup>th</sup>, 2013**

5. Revise the parking screen wall design to match the building architecture in material, color and texture; submit to Planning for staff approval prior to building permit submittal.
6. Compliance with Planning and Zoning case# Z13-059 for Site Plan review and Land Split case# LS13-06.

F. General Plan Presentation:

Staff member Tom Ellsworth gave a presentation on the General Plan.

Vice Chair Paul:

- Thought that as a Design Review Board each development can be approached in context of the character of the area.

Boardmember Sandstrom:

- Questioned the abandonment of big box development and the sea of asphalt and if the City of Mesa is thinking about how to make this situation better.
- Asked about incentives and less stringent requirements for developers to create fabulous mixed use development.

G. Other Business:

None.

H. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 6:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Kerran  
Planning Assistant

jk